

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

**THRIFTY RENT-A-CAR SYSTEMS, INC.,** )  
**an Oklahoma corporation, DTG OPERATIONS,**)  
**INC., an Oklahoma corporation and** )  
**RENTAL CAR FINANCE CORP.,** )  
**an Oklahoma corporation,** )

**Plaintiffs,** )

**v.** )

**Case No. 04-CV-0751-CVE-SAJ**

**SOUTH FLORIDA TRANSPORT, INC.,** )  
**a Florida corporation, DANNY L. HARDY,** )  
**an individual, and ALAN I. GREENSTEIN,** )  
**an individual,** )

**Defendants.** )


**OPINION AND ORDER**

Now before the Court is defendant Greenstein's Motion to Amend and for New Trial (Dkt. # 69), which the Court deems a Rule 60 motion for relief from this Court's Opinion and Order (Dkt. # 64), dated October 26, 2005, granting plaintiff's motion for summary judgment against defendant. Defendant submits that the accelerated schedule of this matter and his ignorance of applicable discovery deadlines prevented him from completing discovery necessary to defeat plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment.

Despite defendant's representation, this case has proceeded pursuant to the Court's standard scheduling procedures and has never been set on a "fast track." Moreover, the Court notes that prior to granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, it took particular care to consider each of the defenses advanced by defendant in his answer to ensure that the summary judgment record supported plaintiffs' claim of entitlement to summary judgment. Only after completing this review did the Court conclude that summary judgment against defendant was appropriate.

While the Court is to engage in a liberal construction of pro se pleadings, it is a well-established principle in this circuit that pro se plaintiffs must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants. Garrett v. Selby Connor Maddux & Janer, 425 F.3d 836, 840 (10th Cir. 2005); Nielsen v. Price, 17 F.3d 1276, 1277 (10th Cir. 1994); Green v. Dorrell, 969 F.2d 915, 917 (10th Cir. 1992). This rule encompasses adherence to the schedule established by the Court. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion to amend and for new trial (Dkt. # 69) is hereby **denied**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 10th day of November, 2005.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CLAIRE V. EAGAN, CHIEF JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT